

Appl. No.: 10/690,793
Amdt. dated: 12/06/2007
Reply to Office action of: 08/24/2007

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In the Office action of August 24, 2007, the drawings and the specification were objected to and claims 1-45 were rejected.

The respective drawings were objected to for the following reasons and the applicants request amendment of the application in response to the specific objection:

FIG. 1 is amended to replace "JAVA APZ CLASS FILES" in item 20 with "JAVA API CLASS FILES."

FIG. 3 is amended to add the legend – Prior Art --.

FIG. 4A was objected to because reference item 44 was not included in the specification. The reference character "44" has been added following "computer" in [0048] of the attached substitute specification.

FIG. 5 was objected to because reference item 110 was not included in the specification. The reference character "110" has been added following "VMs" in [0051] of the substitute specification.

FIG. 8 was objected to because reference item 206 was not included in the specification. The reference character "206" has been added following fifth occurrence of "VM" in [0063] of the substitute specification.

FIG. 10B was objected to because reference item 330 was not included in the specification. The reference to " application 330" has been added following "thread 328" in [0068] of the substitute specification.

FIG. 11 was objected to because reference items 416 and 418 were not mentioned in the specification. FIG. 11 has been amended to replace reference character "416" with "332" and reference character "418" with "334." The lock table 332 and the lock manager 334 are identified in [0068] of the substitute specification.

Reference characters 302, 304, 306, and 308 were used to designate, respectively, two different features of the system. FIG. 10A is amended to replace "302" with "303," "304" with "305," "306" with "307," and "308" with "309" as indicated above. Paragraph [0065] of the substitute specification was amended include corresponding changes. The applicants respectfully request withdrawal of objections to the drawings.

The specification stands objected to because acronyms such as DOS, HTML, etc. were

Appl. No.: 10/690,793

Amdt. dated: 12/06/2007

Reply to Office action of: 08/24/2007

used without first including a plain text description of the acronym. In addition, the specification was objected to because lower case letters were used in certain trademarks and trademarks were used without reference to generic goods or services. Attached hereto is a substitute specification, including an annotated copy of the substitute specification indicating changes. Trademarks used in the substitute specification are in upper case letters. Certain trade name references have been revised. The applicants respectfully submit that while JAVA is a trademark, "virtual machine" is a generic device. The applicants submit that the use of trademarks and acronyms in the substitute specification has been corrected and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Claims 4, 19 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as unclear and indefinite because it is uncertain where the plural listener is located and its relationship with the listener recited in claim 1. The applicants request amendment of claims 4, 19 and 24 recite that the system further comprises a "second listener" that is located in the shared object space. The applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 6, 21 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as unclear and indefinite because the claims recite a "native method" but the claim fails to particularly point out which item the method is native to. While the applicants respectfully submit that the claim recites a "native method interface" linking the shared object space and an application and do not recite a "native method," the applicants request amendment of the claims as indicated above to further recite that the interface enables an application to interact with the shared object space with a method native to the application. The applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12-13, 16, 18, 20-25, 27-28, 31, 33, 35-40 and 42-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Veselov (US 7,131,120) (Veselov) in view of Moore et al. (US 7,171,663) (Moore). According to the Office action, the systems of claims 1, 16 and 31 are obvious from Veselov in view of Moore because while Veselov does not disclose a listener associated with an application running in a virtual machine that is listening for an event, Moore discloses a virtual machine with a listener registered to listen for an event and it would have been obvious to include a listener in the virtual machine of Veselov to listen for an event and identify the source application because a listener is a common component of the virtual machine environment. However, the applicants submit, as observed in the Office action, that Veselov says nothing about listening for events occurring in shared resources. While Moore

Appl. No.: 10/690,793

Amdt. dated: 12/06/2007

Reply to Office action of: 08/24/2007

discloses a listener registered to listen for an event, Moore says nothing about shared resources or shared objects and, more particularly, listening for events occurring in shared objects, as is recited in claims 1, 16, and 31. Moreover, while the shared resources of Veselov are located outside of the virtual machines, see FIG. 1, the event monitors (listeners) of Moore only detect and react to events that occur within the virtual machine (col. 4, line(s) 43-46). The applicants request amendment of claims 1, 16 and 31 to further recite that the listener is attached to the shared object and submit that neither Moore nor Veselov disclose a listener attached to a shared object or resource. The applicants also request amendment of claims 1 and 16 to further recite that an event in an object caused by a first application running on a first virtual machine is detectable by second application running on a second virtual machine and submit that the listeners of Moore can only detect events occurring within the machine on which the application that contains them is executing. The applicants submit that claims 1, 16, and 31 are not obvious from Veselov in view of Moore because neither Veselov nor Moore nor a combination thereof disclose or suggest a listener attached to a shared object in a shared object space and associated with an application to listen for an occurrence of an event in the object. Further, with regard to claims 16 and 31, the applicants respectfully submit that Moore and, more particularly, col. 5, lines 18-22 of Moore, relied on in the Office action, does not indicate that the listeners can identify an application causing an event and whether or how the listeners in a virtual machine would identify an application producing an event in a shared object. Further with regard to claim 31, the applicants respectfully submit that while Veselov indicates that the requester of an event in a shared object may be identifiable to the object, nothing in Veselov or Moore discloses or suggests that a listener can identify the requester of an event in a shared object from the object. The applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 16 and 31 are not obvious from Veselov in view of Moore and request withdrawal of the rejection.

With regard to claims 2-15, 17-30, and 32-45, the applicants respectfully submit that the claims are dependent from one of claims 1, 16, and 31, or a claim dependent therefrom, and inherit all of the limitations of the claim(s) from which each respectively depends. Since claims 1, 16 and 31 are not obvious from the combination of Veselov and Moore for the reasons indicated above, claims 2-15, 17-30, and 32-45 are likewise not obvious from the combination of Veselov and Moore or the combination of Veselov and Moore and Barinov et al. (US 2004/0025171) for at least the same reasons. Further, with regard to:

Appl. No.: 10/690,793

Amdt. dated: 12/06/2007

Reply to Office action of: 08/24/2007

Claims 6, 21 and 36, the applicants respectfully submit that Veselov does not disclose linking a shared object with an application by a native method interface.

Claims 7, 22 and 37, the applicants respectfully submit that while Veselov discloses one or more libraries and a method for selecting a library it does not indicate that the default library contains a native library.

Claims 12, 27, and 42, the applicants respectfully submit that Veselov discloses copying a repository but does not disclose or suggest that the shared resource is copied during sharing.

Claims 2, 17 and 32 recite locating the listener in a shared object space. According to the Office action, Barinov discloses a listener located in a shared object space (page 3, paragraph 31). The applicants respectfully submit that while Barinov discloses listeners located in an application kernel, there is no indication, in the referenced paragraph or elsewhere, that the application kernel is a shared object space or capable of storing a shared object and FIG. 3 shows objects to be stored in a data base outside of the application kernel. The applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-15, 17-30, and 32-45.

The applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

This amendment is submitted with a request for extension of time and the applicants provisionally petition for an additional extension of time, if necessary. The applicants assert that no additional claim fees are due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge

Appl. No.: 10/690,793


Amdt. dated: 12/06/2007

Reply to Office action of: 08/24/2007

any required additional fee for any additional extension of time or additional claims to the Deposit Account identified in the enclosed petition for extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,
Chernoff, Vilhauer, McClung & Stenzel, L.L.P.
Suite 1600
601 SW Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

By:



Timothy A. Long

Reg. No. 28,876

Telephone No. (503) 227-5631


FAX No. (503) 228-4373

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Dated:

12/06/2007



Timothy A. Long

Appl. No.: 10/690,793

Amdt. dated: 12/06/2007

Reply to Office action of: 08/24/2007

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to FIG(S). 1, 3, and 11. These sheets which includes FIG(S). 1, 3 and 11, replace the original sheets including FIG(S). 1, 3 and 11.

The following changes have been made in the respective FIG(s):

FIG. 1	"JAVA API CLASS FILES" WAS "JAVA APZ CLASS FILES"
FIG. 3	(PRIOR ART) legend added
FIG. 10A	"303" was "302," "305" was "304," "307" was "306," and "309" was "308"
FIG. 11	"332" WAS "416" AND "334" WAS "418"

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes